DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 243 023 CG 017 390

AUTHOR Dettmann, David F.; Colangelo, Nicholas
TITLE Characteristics of Moral Problems Formulated by Students Aged 8-49.
PUB DATE 29 Aug 83
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (91st, Anaheim, CA, August 26-30, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Age Differences; *Moral Development; *Moral Values; Motifs; Research Design; Story Telling; Students; *Value Judgment
IDENTIFIERS *Kohlberg (Lawrence)

ABSTRACT

Although the theory and research of Lawrence Kohlberg have been the dominant approach in the study of moral reasoning and moral development, his procedures have been criticized in three areas: (1) reliability and validity; (2) applicability to daily experience; and (3) inadequate sampling. To examine the characteristics of moral problems formulated by students of different ages, 546 students participated in a study comparing their responses to the dilemmas proferred by Kohlberg. The sample consisted of 304 students in grades 3-8, 108 students in grades 9-12, 53 college students, and 81 graduate students. Subjects wrote stories involving a moral problem, provided a solution, and discussed their reasoning. Results, based on ratings of the stories, showed that most had major characters who were same-sex peers of the writer, compared to Kohlberg's hypothetical stories, which are chiefly male, adult-oriented. The most common themes in the students' stories were interpersonally-based between the protagonist and subsidiary characters, while Kohlberg's stories emphasize conflicts between individuals and societal values. Kohlberg's moral vignettes are hypothetical and abstract, while the students' stories involved practical, everyday experiences. The findings suggest that the sex of the characters, and the type and variety of moral stories, should be considered in research on moral development. (JAC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED243023

Characteristics of Moral Problems Formulated by Students Aged 8-49

David F. Dettmann
Doctoral Candidate
Counseling Psychology
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242

Nicholas Colangelo
Associate Professor
Counseling Psychology
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242

Paper presented at the 91st Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association; Anaheim, CA, August 29, 1983.

Please do not quote or reproduce without permission from authors.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
David F. Dettmann
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CG 017390

Characteristics of Moral Problems Formulated by Students Aged 8-49

Introduction

The dominant approach in studying moral reasoning and moral development has been the theory and research of Lawrence Kohlberg. Kohlberg (1958, 1968, 1969) has shown that moral judgment progresses through qualitatively different stages in a sequence that is universal and invariant. Kohlberg's theory is based on clinical interviews with subjects who are presented with hypothetical moral dilemmas and a series of questions. Responses to these questions are analyzed to determine the stage of moral reasoning of the subject.

Kohlberg's procedures have been criticized in three main areas. First, Kurtines and Greif (1974) have shown that the assessment of moral reasoning lacks strength in reliability and validity. Second, Kohlberg's hypothetical dilemmas are too abstract or removed from the daily experiences of most people. Thus it is difficult for most people to determine what they would actually do in a given situation (Colangelo, 1977; Leming, 1973; Straughan, 1975). Third, the hypothetical moral dilemmas do not adequately sample the diversity of moral problems (Yussen, 1977).

Yussen (1977) conducted a study in response to some of these criticisms leveled at Kohlberg. Students in grades 7, 9, and 12 were asked to spontaneously formulate (in writing) moral dilemmas. Yussen found that "when children spontaneously formulate written dilemmas, they may produce something very different from the dilemmas used by Kohlberg and his colleagues to assess moral reasoning" (p. 163). Yussen also reported that the age and sex of the child influenced some of the characteristics of their written dilemmas.

The assistance of Colette Fleuridas and Cynthia Baldwin as raters and discussants is gratefully acknowledged.

Colangelo (1982) used the Yussen procedure in a study of moral problems formulated by gifted adolescents. Colangelo found that gifted students in grades 9-12 also wrote stories quite different from Kohlberg's hypothetical moral dilemmas. In addition, the gifted students' stories were also different from Yussen's results in several categories. For example, the gifted students had a considerable percentage of their stories involving self-concept questions of "Who am I?" and concerns with existence and loneliness.

The primary purpose of the present study was to provide a descriptive analysis of moral problems as spontaneously formulated by students of a wide age range. It was hypothesized that the characteristics of these moral problems would be different from the dilemmas proferred by Kohlberg and that the age and sex of the subject would affect the characteristics in their written moral stories.

Method

Questionnaire

The Moral Problem Characteristics Questionnaire (MPCQ) was developed out of the prototype used by Yussen (1977) and Colangelo (1982). The MPCQ instructed the subjects to write "a story in which the person or persons face some kind of a moral problem that is not easy to solve." The subjects were to then answer five open-ended essay-type questions regarding how the moral problem would be solved and the reasoning behind the solution and moral issue of the problem. The term "moral problem" was not defined for the students, nor were examples provided since Yussen (1977) found that students produce "thinly veiled imitations of examples" (p. 16).

Subjects

A total of 546 students completed the MPCQ. The sample consisted of 304 students in grades 3-8, 108 in grades 9-12, 53 undergraduate college students, and 81 graduate students. The subjects volunteered to complete the MPCQ following a request by their classroom teachers. The participating classroom teachers had been solicited from three midwestern universities and from a random list of attendees at recent national conferences on

gifted education and from state education workshop lists. Hence, the subjects represent a cross-national sample of students.

Analysis

The 546 completed MPCQs were analyzed independently by two trained raters who had a rating reliability of $r = .94$. Discrepancies were resolved by discussion. The rating categories included nature of central issue, sex and age of major characters (protagonist and subsidiary), relationship of protagonist to subsidiary characters, solution of problem, and ingredients of a moral dilemma.

Results

The results are based on the ratings of the stories. Formal statistical tests were not always appropriate due to the descriptive nature of this study. No statistical comparisons were possible between these stories, Kohlberg's dilemmas, and the stories in Yussen's study. General comparisons and descriptive trends are discussed among the three sets of stories where possible. Tables are also presented to provide detail of the characteristics of moral problems as written by the present sample of students.

Generation of a Story

The vast majority (93%) of all subjects were able to write a story that they felt depicted a moral problem. This is similar to results found by Colangelo (1982) for a gifted adolescent sample. Students in the lower grades (12% in grades 3-5; 10% in grades 6-8) were significantly less able to write stories than students in high school, and undergraduate and graduate college; X^2 (6) = 16.62, $p < .02$. No significant differences were found for sex of subject.

Protagonist of Story

Results indicate that 98.5% of all stories had an identifiable protagonist (figure who must make a moral decision), with 12.5% of these being multiple protagonists. This is similar to Colangelo's (1982)

findings, but greater than the 83% in Kohlberg's stories and the 81% reported by Yussen (1977). Undergraduate and graduate students had significantly more multiple protagonists than students in grades 3-12; X^2 (15) = 35.45; p <.005. There were no significant differences due to sex of subject.

Sex of Protagonist

All of the major characters in the Kohlberg dilemmas are male. Analysis for the present study revealed that half of the stories involved female protagonists, slightly more than a third had male protagonists, and one-eighth had mixed sex protagonists. The significant effect for subject grade, X^2 = 34.04 (10); p <.001 reflects the college students' greater use of mixed sex protagonists. Female subjects wrote stories involving more female protagonists, while male subjects wrote more male protagonist stories: X^2 (2) = 182.37; p <.001. Table 1 indicates the relationship between grade and sex of subject with sex of protagonist.

Age of Protagonist

Similar to Colangelo (1982), the majority of the stories (81%) had protagonists that were identified as a peer of the subject. A significant effect was found for subject grade level: X^2 (10) = 39.40; p <.001, but no effect for subject sex. Students in college (12.2%) had more stories with younger (than self) protagonists while students in grades 3-12 had more stories ($\overline{X}$ = 18.5%) with older (than self) protagonists. The clear pattern was that subjects wrote stories involving protagonists of their own age group. All of the protagonists in the Kohlberg dilemmas are adults. Table 2 provides the details of the subject grade and sex relationship to protagonist's age.

Self as Protagonist

Most of the subjects (88%) did not spontaneously identify the protagonist as being the subject-writer. Students in the lower grades (21% in grades 3-5, 12% in grades 6-8) were more inclined to use self as the protagonist than upper grade subjects ($\overline{X}$ = 5%) : X^2 (5) = 18.42; p <.005. No comparisons are possible with Kohlberg's dilemmas or Yussen's (1977) stories.

Subsidiary Character of the Story

Results show that 92% of the stories had at least one identifiable subsidiary character (figure[s] who sets up the moral dilemma for the protagonist). This is higher than the 83% for Kohlberg's stories, 54% found in Yussen (1977), and 78% reported by Colangelo (1982). Students in lower grades (3-10) tended to use more multiple subsidiary characters and also have more stories without any identifiable subsidiary character than higher grades (11+); $X^2 = 23.35$ (10); $p < .01$. Female subjects had more stories with multiple subsidiary characters, while male subjects had more stories with no identifiable subsidiary characters and single subsidiary characters: X^2 (2) = 12.40; $p < .005$.

Sex of Subsidiary Character

Almost two-thirds of the stories written had male subsidiary characters, which is similar to Colangelo's (1982) findings, but less than Kohlberg's all male subsidiary characters. No grade effect was found, but a significant effect was found for subject sex: Corrected X^2 (1) = 18.95; $p < .001$. While female subjects had about an equal number of male and female subsidiary characters, male subjects had primarily (80%) male subsidiary characters. Table 1 provides a detailed breakdown of the sex of subsidiary characters by sex and grade of the subject.

Age of Subsidiary Character

Half of the subjects wrote stories using peer aged subsidiary characters. This is different than Kohlberg's use of all adult characters and less than the 76% reported by Colangelo (1982). College students were more likely to use younger (than self) and mixed age subsidiary characters: X^2 (15) = 75.58; $p < .001$. Table 2 depicts the details of the relationship of subject sex and grade to age of subsidiary characters.

Self as Subsidiary Character

Less than 1% of all subjects used self as a subsidiary character, with no effects for subject sex or grade.

Relationship of Protagonist to Subsidiary Character

Age relationship. The majority (57%) of the subjects wrote stories that contained a protagonist who was similar in age to the subsidiary character. There was a significant effect for subject grade: X^2 (15) = 35.22; $p < .005$, but not for subject sex. Students in lower grades tend to write more stories with protagonists similar-aged or younger than the subsidiary characters, while college students had more stories with protagonists older than the subsidiary characters.

Sex relationship. Analysis of the pairs of protagonists-subsidiary characters by sex revealed significant effects for grade: X^2 (25) = 63.11; $p < .001$ and for subject sex: X^2 (5) = 98.30; $p < .001$. Students in lower grades (grades 3-8) tended to write about same sexed (male-male, female-female) major character pairs while upper grade students had approximately an equal distribution of all possible combinations. Female subjects wrote more about female-female, female-male, and female-mixed relationships while male subjects had more relationships with male protagonists in the major character pair. The sex effect is similar to that reported by Colangelo (1982) who did not find a grade effect with his high school sample.

Social relationship. The most prominent social relationships between protagonists and subsidiary characters in Kohlberg's stories involve family and authority relations. Table 3 indicates the various relationships shared by the protagonist and subsidiary characters and the percentage of students who wrote about each relationship. The category family refers to family relations (e.g., parents, siblings); friends refers to relations between people who know each other well and like one another (e.g. friend, buddy); lovers refers to sexual-romantic partners (e.g., boyfriend, girlfriend); acquaintances refers to people who know one another but aren't considered friends; authority refers to relations where one has power, control, or influence over another (e.g., boss, teacher, police officer); strangers refers to people who are unknown to one another; and non-identifiable refers to ambiguous relationships.

While Kohlberg's stories contain no friendship relations, friends and lovers comprised 52% of the stories written by students. Only 22% of the stories involved family relationships and 7% had authority relationships. Students in grades 3-8 had significantly fewer stories involving lovers but more friendships than older students: X^2 (30) = 157.23; $p < .001$. No differences were found for subject sex. These findings are similar to Colangelo (1982) for a sample of adolescents. The relative lack of authority relations is similar to that reported by Yussen (1977) and Colangelo (1982) but much less than Kohlberg's reliance on authority relationships in his dilemmas.

Issues in the Moral Problems

Whereas Kohlberg's dilemmas essentially focus on issues of public welfare and life-and-death (Yussen, 1977), raters in the present study and in Colangelo (1982) were able to identify over 36 different issues in stories written by student subjects. Table 4 shows the percentage of subjects whose moral problems focused on a particular type of issue. The categories of issues are mutually exclusive. Only the 1 or 2 most central issues were identified for each subject.

The individual issues were derived based on Yussen's (1977) and Colangelo's (1982) definitions and were then grouped into categories for statistical analyses. A brief description of the issue categories follows: Life-death refers to conflicts involving suicide, euthanasia, war, etc.; Sex refers to sexual relations, dating, affairs, pregnancy, etc.; Inter-report refers to decisions to intervene or report; Drugs refers to conflicts with alcohol, tobacco, pot, etc.; School refers to issues involving school activities and rules; Relationship issues include peer and family relations; Scout code refers to conflicts regarding honesty, cheating, stealing, and lying; and Self-conflict refers to conflicts about "who am ?," life's meaning, etc.. Other issues that were identified included such topics as civil rights, duty to country, career choices, and financial decisions.

The most popular issues found in this study were those in the Relationship (47%), Intervene-Report (27%), Sex (21%), Scout code (19%), and Drugs (16%) categories. Life and death issues, the focus in Kohlberg's dilemmas, accounted for only 13% of the issues in the present stories by students. Clearly these students wrote about issues of personal and practical concern. For example, almost half of all stories had a central issue focusing on either peer or family relationships.

Several of the issue categories had significant differences between subject grade level and/or subject sex. As would be expected, there was a steady increase in stories that had a Sex issue (dating, pregnancy, etc.) across subject grade levels, ranging from 3% for grades 3-5 to 48% for graduate students: X^2 (10) = 149.35; $p < .001$. However, there were no significant subject sex differences on this issue. Students in grades 9-12 had more stories with Relationship (peer, family) issues than other grade levels: X^2 (10) = 30.53; $p < .001$. Female students had significantly more Relationship issue-type stories (52%) than those written by male students (37%): X^2 (2) = 12.83; $p < .005$. Scout Code issues (e.g., lying, cheating, stealing) were more often found in stories written by students in grades 3-8: X^2 (10) = 33.60; $p < .001$. Students in grades 9-10 had significantly more Self Concept issues than other students: X^2 (5) = 12.97; $p < .05$. Sex differences (males: 22%, females: 12%) were found for the Drugs issue category: X^2 (2) = 9.99; $p < .01$. There were no significant differences due to grade levels for the Life-Death, Intervene-Report, Drugs, School, and Other issue categories. Significant sex differences were not found for the Life-Death, Intervene-Report, School, Scout Code, Self Concept, Other, and Sex issue categories. Thus, not only does there seem to be a variety of issues and issues different from Kohlberg's hypothetical dilemmas, but different issues are of interest or concern at different grade levels and between males and females.

Issue type. The type of issue in each story was also rated according to Nucci's (1981) and Turiel's (1978) conceptions of issues. Nucci (1981) describes personal issues as focusing upon the actor (self) rather than on others (e.g., choice of friends) with the issue of "right or wrong" based on personal preference. Turiel (1978) defines social issues as focusing upon others rather than self (e.g., properly addressing a teacher, following class rules) with propriety based on implicit or explicit societal norms. Moral issues focus on social actions having an effect upon the rights or well-being or others (e.g., hurting someone, stealing) with universal definition of "right or wrong" rather than arbitrary or social regulation evaluation.

Table 5 provides the details of the percentage of issue type by grade and sex of subject. Significant differences were found for subject grade: X^2 (10) = 74.48; $p < .001$. Subjects in grades 3-8 wrote more stories involving personal and moral issues whereas students in grades 9+ had more social type stories. No differences were found for subject sex.

Solutions

The majority of subjects (93%) were able to offer an identifiable solution to their moral dilemma. Table 6 provides the breakdown as to solution characteristics by sex and grade of the subjects. Sixty per cent of the subjects used concrete solutions (specific decision, e.g., "he should not take the money"). No significant effects were found for sex or grade of subject.

A similar percentage (62%) used process-oriented solutions (subject describes a process how problem could be solved; e.g., "she should talk to her mother to find an answer"). Significant effects were found for subject grade and sex. Subjects in grades 3-8 were less likely to use process-oriented solutions than subjects in grades 9+: X^2 (5) = 22.93; $p < .001$. Female subjects used more process solutions than male subjects: Corrected X^2 (1) = 4.19; $p < .05$.

Approximately half of the subjects specifically delineated multiple (2 or more distinct alternatives) solutions. Subject grade and sex made significant differences. Subjects in grades 3-8 had fewer stories with multiple solutions than subjects in grades 9+: X^2 (5) = 37.02; p <.001. Female subjects had more multiple solution stories than male subjects: Corrected X^2 (1) = 9.06; p <.005.

A few subjects (8% overall) spontaneously and explicitly described how the moral problem could have been prevented. High school students had more prevention references than either younger or older subjects: X^2 (5) = 23.99; p <.001. No significant differences were found for subject sex.

The solutions were also analyzed with respect to whether or not they indicated primarily a personal or social perspective. In this study the category personal perspective refers to solutions predominantly focusing on needs of self and the consequences for the self. Social perspective refers to solutions predominantly focusing on needs of others and the consequences that a particular solution would have on others. Approximately equal numbers of subjects used the social and the personal perspective. There were no significant effects due to subject sex or grade.

Problem Definition

Subjects were asked to define what they felt made their problem a moral dilemma. These answers were analyzed as to whether or not an explicit differentiation was made by the subject. A response was considered differentiated if it explicitly described how the story was a moral issue, (e.g., "People should not steal food even if they are very hungry."), rather than described in general terms (could refer to any type of a problem; e.g., "it is a question of right or wrong," "it involves a decision"). More than half of all students (59%) could make a specific differentiated definition, with college students making more such differentiations: X^2 (5) = 11.83; p <.05. There were no significant effects due to subject sex.

Responses to the two questions regarding their definition of a moral problem (own story and problems in general) were rated and analyzed for the reasons or rationale behind the definition. Over 50 distinctly different reasons were made by the subjects. Up to three reasons were rated for each of the two questions. These reasons were then grouped into the following categories for data analyses: Causes refers to reasons focusing on how the problem was personally caused (e.g., "one knows it shouldn't be done but does it anyway," "getting yourself in trouble"); Beliefs refers to reasons based on beliefs, values, morals, standards, etc.; Decision refers to reasons describing a choice to be made, alternatives, unknown answers; Conflict refers to conflict between either self and others or within the self (e.g., "conflict between what I want and what others need," "problem between my values and my desires"); Right-wrong describes reasons that focus on "right versus wrong"; Concrete refers to explicit aspects of the story (e.g., drugs, people, death, sex, etc.); Unique relates to "one-of-a-kind" answers that were not classifiable; and Quality refers to qualitative aspects (e.g., harder, longer to solve, more personal, more serious).

The vast majority of the subjects (92%) were able to provide at least one reason defining their moral story or moral problems in general. Subjects in lower grades (3-8) had greater difficulty ($\bar{X}$ = 13%) than subjects in grades 9+ ($\bar{X}$ = 0.8%): X^2 (10) = 58.36; $p < .001$. There were twice as many male subjects than female subjects who could not provide at least one reason: X^2 (2) = 7.43; $p < .05$. Table 7 provides a breakdown by type of reason for subject grade and sex.

Causal reasons were used by only 4% of all subjects, with no significant effects due to subject sex or grade. Reasons focusing on Beliefs were used by 29% of the subjects. Subjects in grades 11 through graduate school used more belief reasons than younger subjects: X^2 (10) = 138.32; $p < .001$. Female subjects made more belief statements than did male subjects: X^2 (2) = 6.17; $p < .05$.

Approximately one-quarter (28%) of all subjects used Decision reasons, with college students using these reasons more often than subjects in grades 3-12: X^2 (10) = 38.91; p <.001. No differences were found for subject sex.

Conflict reasons were listed by 12% of the subjects. The percentage using conflict reasons increased significantly from 1% in grades 3-5 to 37% in graduate school: X^2 (10) = 93.56; p <.001. No significant effect was observed for subject sex.

Upper grade subjects (9+) also used Right-wrong reasons more often than lower grade (3-8) subjects: X^2 (10) = 49.54; p <.001. No significant effects were found for subject sex.

Concrete reasons were made by almost two-thirds (66.1%) of all subjects. Students in the lower grades (3-10) tended to make fewer concrete references than subjects in grades 11+: X^2 (10) = 19.02; p <.05. No significant effects were found for subject sex.

Over half (53.3%) of the subjects also listed Quality reasons in defining moral problems. Students in high school used these reasons more than other subjects: X^2 (10) = 24.22; p <.01. There was no significant differences due to subject sex.

Unique reasons were found in about 12% of all responses. Subjects in grades 9+ made more unique descriptions than subjects in grades 3-8: X^2 (10) = 34.04; p <.001. Sex effects were not significant.

Discussion and Implications

The present study offers some insight into a wide range of students and their conception of moral problems. Some of these conceptions are similar to previous findings (Colangelo, 1982; Yussen, 1977) using a similar methodology. However, the characteristics of the problems generated by these students differ considerably compared to Kohlberg's hypothetical problems. Most of the present stories involved peer-aged, like-sexed characters, whereas Kohlberg's stories are chiefly male, adult-oriented. Since Freeman and Giebink (1974) and Freeman (1974) have reported that the sex of the subject and sex of the protagonist

influence the level of moral reasoning, the present findings suggest that the sex of the characters should be given greater attention when formulating hypothetical moral stories.

Kohlberg's moral vignettes are hypothetical and abstract, whereas the present sample wrote stories involving very practical, everyday experiences. Since subjects tend to produce lower moral reasoning with practical moral issues compared with hypothetical (freeman, 1974; Leming, 1973), the type of moral stories used or generated needs to be considered in research on moral development.

Further, Kohlberg's stories emphasize conflicts between individuals and societal values. This is in direct contrast to previous research (Colangelo, 1982; Yussen, 1977) and the present findings where many moral issues are generated, with a majority being interpersonally-oriented. This suggests that Kohlberg's stories offer only a very limited sample of moral issues (Colangelo, 1982).

The present study has thus provided a description of the rich and various conceptions of moral stories written by students of a wide age range. These results indicate significant areas of differences with hypothetical moral dilemmas (e.g., Kohlberg's) and hopefully offer a beginning direction for conceptualizing how people actually think about moral issues.

References

Colangelo, N. (1977). Identifying moral judgment in interviews. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Colangelo, N. (1982). Characteristics of moral problems as formulated by gifted youngsters. Journal of Moral Education, 11, 219-232.

Freeman, S. J. (1974). Individual differences in moral judgment by children and adolescents. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Freeman, S. J., & Giebink, J. W. (1979). Moral judgment as function of age, sex and stimulus. The Journal of Psychology, 102, 43-7.

Kohlberg, L. (1958). The development of modes of moral thinking and choice in years ten to sixteen. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.

Kohlberg, L. (1968). Moral development. International encyclopedia of the social sciences. New York: Cromwell, Collier and Macmillan, Inc.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive developmental approach to socialization. In D. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Kurtines, W., & Greif, E. G. (1974). The development of moral thought: Review and evaluation of Kohlberg's approach. Psychological Bulletin, 81, 453-70.

Leming, J. S. (1973). Adolescent moral judgment and deliberation on classical and practical moral dilemmas. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Nucci, L. (1981). Conceptions of personal issues: A domain distinct from moral or social concepts. Child Development, 52, 114-121.

Straughan, R. R. (1975). Hypothetical moral situations. Journal of Moral Education, 4, 183-189.

Turiel, E. (1978). The development of concepts of social structure. In J. Glick & A. Clarke-Stewart (Eds.), Personality and social development, Vol. I. New York: Gardner.

Yussen, S. R. (1977). Characteristics of moral dilemmas written by adolescents. Developmental Psychology, 13, 162-163.

Table 1

Percentage of Subjects who Wrote about Male and Female Characters (protagonists and subsidiary) by Grade and Sex of Subject

Subjects		Sex of Characters[1]		
Grade	Sex	Male	Female	Mixed
3-5	Male	89 (91)	7 (9)	4 (-)
	Female	15 (36)	83 (64)	2 (-)
	Total	46 (59)	52 (41)	3 (-)
6-8	Male	88 (92)	4 (8)	8 (-)
	Female	19 (47)	69 (53)	12 (-)
	Total	47 (66)	43 (34)	10 (-)
9-10	Male	53 (82)	26 (18)	21 (-)
	Female	20 (69)	70 (31)	10 (-)
	Total	31 (74)	56 (26)	14 (-)
11-12	Male	53 (58)	24 (42)	24 (-)
	Female	16 (74)	80 (26)	4 (-)
	Total	31 (68)	57 (32)	12 (-)
Undergrad.	Male	47 (63)	18 (38)	35 (-)
	Female	15 (77)	68 (23)	18 (-)
	Total	26 (71)	51 (29)	24 (-)
Graduate	Male	55 (42)	14 (58)	32 (-)
	Female	19 (58)	63 (42)	19 (-)
	Total	26 (53)	51 (47)	24 (-)
Overall	Male	74 (80)	12 (21)	15 (-)
	Female	17 (53)	72 (47)	10 (-)
	Total	38 (64)	50 (37)	12 (-)

[1] Subsidiary characters are in parentheses ( ).

Table 2

Percentage of Subjects Who Wrote About Younger, Peer, Older, and Mixed-aged Characters (Protagonist and Subsidiary) by Grade and Sex of Subject.

Subjects		Age of Characters[1] Compared to Subject			
Grade	Sex	Younger	Peer	Older	Mixed
3-5	Male	0 (4)	77 (50)	23 (32)	-- (14)
	Female	0 (3)	86 (56)	14 (28)	-- (14)
	Total	0 (3)	82 (53)	18(30)	-- (14)
6-8	Male	2 (2)	77 (66)	22 (26)	-- (6)
	Female	3 (4)	79 (60)	19 (28)	-- (7)
	Total	2 (4)	78 (63)	20 (27)	-- (7)
9-10	Male	0 (5)	84 (74)	16 (11)	-- (11)
	Female	0 (0)	80 (48)	20 (23)	-- (30)
	Total	0 (2)	81 (56)	19 (19)	-- (24)
11-12	Male	0 (0)	81 (69)	19 (25)	-- (6)
	Female	4 (4)	81 (69)	15(15)	-- (12)
	Total	2 (2)	81 (69)	17 (19)	-- (10)
Under-	Male	6 (19)	81 (50)	13 (6)	-- (25)
grad.	Female	15 (23)	79 (37)	6 (10)	-- (30)
	Total	12 (22)	80 (41)	8 (9)	-- (28)
Graduate	Male	10 (13)	86 (56)	5 (13)	-- (19)
	Female	13 (28)	81 (37)	6 (14)	-- (22)
	Total	12 (24)	82 (42)	5 (13)	-- (21)
Overall	Male	2 (6)	79 (60)	18 (23)	-- (12)
	Female	5 (9)	81 (52)	14 (22)	-- (17)
	Total	4 (8)	81 (55)	15 (22)	-- (16)

[1]Subsidiary characters in parentheses ( ).

Table 3

Percentage of Subjects by Grade and Sex whose Protagonist and Subsidiary Characters Shared the Following Relationships

	Grade and Sex of Subject													
	3-5		6-8		9-10		11-12		Undergrad.		Graduate		Overall	
Relationship	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Family	23	29	16	25	16	24	22	4	11	14	26	32	19	24
Friends	40	43	40	40	37	31	17	39	28	29	0	14	31	34
Lovers	0	3	2	4	32	33	44	54	44	40	44	29	18	20
Acquaintances	12	14	18	17	0	2	0	4	6	3	0	5	9	9
Authority	6	1	12	8	0	2	11	0	6	6	13	14	8	6
Stranger	4	4	8	4	5	5	0	0	6	0	13	4	6	3
Non-identifiable	15	6	6	1	11	2	6	0	0	9	4	2	8	4

Table 4

Percentage of Subjects by Grade and Sex who Formulated Moral Stories with a Focus on the Following Issue Categories

	Subject's Grade and Sex													
	3-5		6-8		9-10		11-12		Undergrad.		Graduate		Overall	
Issue Category	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Life-death	15	10	12	13	10	19	11	4	28	9	17	17	13	12
Sex	0	4	5	5	30	26	44	50	50	57	52	47	19	23
Inter-Report	31	27	36	27	24	16	28	19	44	26	17	26	31	25
Drugs	22	10	25	17	43	16	22	12	6	9	4	9	22	12
School	9	2	0	2	5	0	0	4	0	9	4	2	4	3
Relationship	31	55	32	39	62	72	50	77	33	51	39	43	37	52
Scout Code	22	21	22	35	5	2	11	11	11	14	13	15	17	20
Self Concept	6	5	2	11	5	23	0	4	6	3	22	5	6	9
Other	16	12	14	11	0	7	17	4	0	3	13	14	12	10

Table 5

Percentage of Subjects by Grade and Sex Who Wrote Stories Defined by Issue Type

Subjects		Issue Type		
Grade	Sex	Personal	Social	Moral
3-5	Male	25	29	46
	Female	19	39	42
	Total	22	35	44
6-8	Male	7	35	57
	Female	17	25	58
	Total	13	29	58
9-10	Male	5	76	19
	Female	7	56	37
	Total	6	63	31
11-12	Male	6	67	28
	Female	4	73	23
	Total	5	71	25
Under-	Male	0	56	44
grad.	Female	3	69	29
	Total	2	64	34
Graduate	Male	0	70	30
	Female	0	55	45
	Total	0	59	41
Overall	Male	11	47	42
	Female	11	46	43
	Total	11	46	43

Table 6

Percentage of Subjects by Grade and Sex whose Solutions had the Following Characteristics

	Grade and Sex of Subject													
	3-5		6-8		9-10		11-12		Undergrad.		Graduate		Overall	
Characteristics	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Concrete	53	61	55	62	68	54	67	67	67	71	67	61	58	62
Process	37	54	56	63	67	74	83	70	67	60	61	78	56	65
Multiple	19	36	46	51	62	63	44	73	39	51	52	69	40	54
Prevention	5	7	2	9	29	9	39	12	11	6	0	2	10	7
Perspective:														
Personal	63	47	52	53	52	58	44	73	56	69	61	41	56	53
Social	37	53	48	47	48	42	56	27	44	31	39	59	44	47

Table 7

Percentage of Subjects by Grade and Sex who Used the Following Reason Categories in Defining Moral Problems (their own and in general)

	Grade and Sex of Subject													
	3-5		6-8		9-10		11-12		Undergrad.		Graduate		Overall	
Reason Categories	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Causes	4	2	7	5	5	7	6	8	6	0	9	0	6	3
Beliefs	12	9	10	15	19	33	50	50	56	71	48	64	23	32
Decision	25	27	27	27	29	28	17	11	50	40	30	33	28	28
Conflict	0	2	9	1	5	12	22	23	22	23	35	38	11	13
Right-wrong	7	12	14	14	33	35	39	46	33	34	26	26	19	23
Concrete	57	65	59	65	71	63	72	69	78	77	74	71	64	67
Quality	50	53	42	53	62	74	56	81	39	43	48	50	52	56
Unique	2	6	7	7	33	16	22	31	22	11	22	12	12	11
None	26	18	27	22	24	19	11	0	0	3	4	0	20	13